MACK LLP

and admits that it has a place of business at 3491 Mission Oaks Blvd., Camarillo, CA 93011.

- 3. Central Purchasing denies the allegations of Paragraph 3 of the Complaint.
- 4. Central Purchasing denies the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
- 5. Central Purchasing admits that Plaintiff's Complaint purports to allege a claim arising under the Patent Laws of the United States of America, Title 35, United Sates Code, and further admits that Plaintiff's Complaint alleges jurisdiction for the purported claim based upon Title 28, United States Code §§ 1331, 13329a), and 1338(a).
- 6. Central Purchasing denies that it has committed acts of infringement in this District, and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to truth of the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- 7. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
- 8. As its response to Paragraph 8 of the Complaint, Central Purchasing repeats its responses to the allegations Paragraphs 1 through 7 of the Complaint as if set forth fully herein.
- 9. Central Purchasing admits the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.
- 10. Central Purchasing denies the allegations of Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.
- 11. Central Purchasing admits that it manufactures certain products identified in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, but denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint. Central Purchasing further denies that the term

2728

24

25

"Accused Products," as defined in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, apples to the products enumerated or otherwise referenced in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

- 12. Central Purchasing denies that its products are manufactured through the use of the '184 patented process, or that the manufacture of its products is otherwise infringing, and admits the remaining allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
- 13. Central Purchasing denies the allegations of Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
- 14. Central Purchasing admits the allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.
- 15. Central Purchasing is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to truth as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.
- 16. Central Purchasing denies the allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.
- 17. Responding to Paragraph 17 of the Complaint, Central Purchasing denies that it has manufactured, imported, sold, or offered for sale products manufactured through the use of the "184 patented process" and admits the remaining allegations of Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.
- 18. Responding to Paragraph 18 of the Complaint, Central Purchasing refers to the notice, drawing and claim chart referenced by Plaintiff in Paragraph 18 for their exact terms and otherwise denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
- 19. Central Purchasing denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

1	20. Responding to Paragraph 20 of the Complaint, Central Purchasing				
2	refers to the "initial letter" referenced by Plaintiff in Paragraph 20 for its exact				
3	terms and denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 20 of the Complaint.				
4	21. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 21 of the				
5	Complaint.				
6	22. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in paragraph 22 of the				
7	Complaint.				
8	23. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 23 of the				
9	Complaint				
10	24. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 24 of the				
11	Complaint.				
12	25. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 25 of the				
13	Complaint.				
14	26. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 26 of the				
15	Complaint.				
16	27. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 27 of the				
17	Complaint.				
18	28. Central Purchasing denies the allegations in Paragraph 28 of the				
19	Complaint.				
20	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
21	Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.				
22	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
23	The claims of the '184 Patent are invalid under one or more of the following:				
24	35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.				
25					
26					
27 28					
۷۵ ا	852227.1 - 4 - ANSWER SDOWGS 0200 (DTM) (CAR)				

SDCV08-0309 (BTM) (CAB)

COUNTERCLAIMS

Central Purchasing LLC files these Counterclaims against Jens Erik Sorensen and the Sorensen Research and Development Trust (collectively, "SRDT"):

Nature and Basis of the Action

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment that U.S. Patent No. 4,935,184 (hereinafter the '184 Patent) is invalid, and is not infringed by Central Purchasing.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 2. These counterclaims are asserted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 13, and also under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of these Counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 2201. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.
- 3. As demonstrated by the Plaintiff's Complaint, and the Answer and Affirmative Defenses in this Action, an actual, substantial, and continuing controversy exists between Central Purchasing and Plaintiff, SRDT, with respect to the invalidity and non-infringement of the '184 Patent.

COUNT I

(Declaration of Invalidity of the '184 Patent)

- 4. Central Purchasing repeats and realleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 3 of the Counterclaims above as if set forth fully herein.
- 5. By virtue of SRDT's filing of its Complaint, an actual controversy exists between SRDT and Central Purchasing with respect to the validity of the '184 Patent.

26 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27 ///

1 6. The claims of the '184 Patent are invalid under one or more of the 2 following provisions of Title 35 of the United States Code: §§ 101, 102, 103, and 3 112. 4 **COUNT II** 5 (Declaration of Non-Infringement of the '184 Patent) 6 7. Central Purchasing repeats and realleges the allegations in Paragraphs 7 1 through 6 of the Counterclaims as if set forth fully herein. 8 By way of SRDT's filing of its Complaint, an actual controversy exists 9 between Central Purchasing with respect to the infringement of the '184 Patent. 10 The Central Purchasing products identified by SRDT in the Complaint 9. 11 and in its prior correspondence with Central Purchasing do not infringe the '184 12 Patent. 13 WHEREFORE, Defendant Central Purchasing respectfully requests that the 14 Court enter a (1) judgment dismissing Plaintiff's Complaint in its entirety, (2) 15 declaring that the '184 Patent is invalid, (3) declaring that Central Purchasing has 16 not infringed the '184 Patent, and (4) granting such other and further relief that the 17 Court deems just and proper. 18 /// 19 /// 20 /// 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 ///

> ANSWER SDCV08-0309 (BTM) (CAB)

///

27

С	ase 3:08-cv-00309-BTM-CAB	Document 9	Filed 04/01/2008	Page 7 of 10		
1	REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL					
2	Defendant Central Purchasing hereby requests a jury to try any issue triable					
3	of right before a jury.					
4						
5	DATED: April 1, 2008		HIGGS, FLETCHER	& MACK LLP		
6			\	12 .		
7			By: SUSAN E. BASIN	Basinoge		
8			Attorneys for Defe CENTRAL PURC	endant /		
9			,			
10	Dated: April 1, 2008		SILLS CUMMIS &	& GROSS P.C.		
11	11					
12			By: /S/ Mark J. Ro	osenberg		
13			MARK J. ROSI Attorneys for D	ENBERG efendant		
14			CENTRAL PUI California Corp	efendant RCHASING, LLC a oration; and DOES		
15			1-100			
16 17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	852227.1	- 7 -		ANSWER SDCV08-0309 (BTM) (CAB)		

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

BY ELECTRONIC FILING:

I am familiar with the United States District Court, Southern District of California's practice for collecting and processing electronic filings. Under that practice, documents are electronically filed with the court. The court's CM/ECF system will generate a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the filing party, the assigned judge, and any registered users in the case. The NEF will constitute service of the document. Registration as a CM/ECF user constitutes consent to electronic service through the court's transmission facilities. Under said practice, the following CM/ECF users were served:

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9 Melody A. Kramer, Esq.
Kramer Law Offices, Inc.
9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 1600
San Diego, CA 92121

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

J. Michael Kaler, Esq. Kaler Law Offices 9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 200 San Diego, CA 92121 Attorney for Plaintiff

JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of Sorensen Research and Development Trust

Phone: (858) 362-3150 mak@kramerlawip.com

Attorney for Plaintiff
JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee
of Sorensen Research and
Development Trust
Phone: (858) 362-3151

Phone: (858) 362-3151 Michael@kalerlaw.com

BY UNITED STATES MAIL:

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit. The following non-CM/ECF users were served:

2324

25

26

Mark J. Rosenberg
Sills, Cummis & Gross PC
One Rockerfeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020

Co-Counsel for Defendant CENTRAL PURCHASING, LLC Phone: (212) 500-1563 mrosenberg@sillscummis.com

27

28

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN DIEGO

849888.1

2

CASE NO.

Ca	se 3:08-cv-00309-BTM-CAB Document 9 Filed 04/01/2008 Page 10 of 10
1	I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose
2	direction the service was made.
3	Executed on April 1, 2008, at San Diego, California.
4	
5	LINDA McMULLEN 105683-1
6	LINDA McMULLEN 105683-1
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO